

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Amendment and Remarks filed on 3/11/2008. Claims 1-58 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England, US pat. No.6,144,991 in view of Bose et al. US Pub. No.2002/0042830.
As to claim 1, England discloses a method in data processing system for collaboration, comprising the steps of: receiving a first request to perform an operation synchronously with a live session by a collaboration tool (see abstract, figs.8, 9, col.12 line 15 to col.13 line 6); executing the operation in response to the first synchronous request by the collaboration tool and receiving a second request to perform the same operation asynchronously with the live session by the collaboration tool (see col.14 lines 15-62); and executing the operation in response to the second asynchronous request by the collaboration tool (see col.15 line 25 to col.16 line 33).
England does not specifically disclose that the operation including interacting with an interactive element of the live session. However, Bose discloses the operation including interacting with an interactive element of the live session (providing for Interactive

Question and Answer potentially used during live training sessions such that the trainer may send responses back to one as a subset or all students participating in the session, see abstract, [0095] to [0100]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Bose's teachings into the computer system of England to control user's interactions in a presentation because it would have provided a real-time messaging system for delivering messages to recipients/users when messages are originated during live communications.

As to claim 2, England discloses receiving the first request via a graphical user interface; and receiving the second request via the graphical user interface (see fig.10, col.13 lines 7-31 and col.14 lines 15-64).

As to claim 3, England discloses executing the operations in response to the first request further comprises the steps of detecting the presence of another user to determine whether the user is online and executing the operation based on the determination (see fig.9, col.14 line 36 to col.15 line 65).

As to claims 4-6, England discloses executing the operation based on the determination further comprises the step of delaying execution of the operation based the determination, sending a question and sending an answer in response to a question (see col.14 line 15 to col.15 line 65 and col.19 lines 13-56).

As to claims 7-9, England discloses wherein the operation comprises sending a file, sending a quiz and sending a response to a quiz (see col.14 line 15 to col.15 line 65 and col.19 lines 13-56).

As to claim 10, England discloses a method in a data processing system having a collaboration tool, the method comprising the steps performed by the collaboration tool of: displaying a graphical user interface including a plurality of operations (see abstract, figs.8, 9, col.12 line 15 to col.13 line 6); receiving a first request to perform one of the operations in a synchronous manner and receiving a second request to perform the one operation in an asynchronous manner (see col.14 lines 15-62 and col.15 line 25 to col.16 line 33).

England does not specifically disclose that the operation including interacting with an interactive element of the live session. However, Bose discloses the operation including interacting with an interactive element of the live session (providing for Interactive Question and Answer potentially used during live training sessions such that the trainer may send responses back to one as a subset or all students participating in the session, see abstract, [0095] to [0100]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Bose's teachings into the computer system of England to control user's interactions in a presentation because it would have provided a real-time messaging system for delivering messages to recipients/users when messages are originated during live communications.

As to claims 11-12, England discloses performing the one operation and recording a live interactive presentation with interactive elements; and playing the recording of the live presentation such that a user is able to interact with the interactive elements (using recording and playback functions, see col. 20 line 32 to col.21 line 27 and col.22 lines 22-64).

As to claims 13-14, England discloses creating a recording using a collaboration tool and providing, during playback of the recording, interactive elements of the collaboration tool available during creation of the recording (using recording and playback functions, see col. 20 line 32 to col.21 line 27 and col.22 lines 22-64).

As to claims 15-19, England discloses that the collaboration tool comprises: a note tool, a question and answer tool, a file transfer tool, quiz tool and a presentation broadcast tool (see col. 20 line 32 to col.21 line 27 and col.22 lines 22-64).

Claims 20-28 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-9 respectively.

Claims 29 and 30 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 10 and 11 respectively.

Claims 31-38 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 12-19 respectively.

Claims 39-47 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-9 respectively.

Claims 48-49 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 10 and 11 respectively.

Claims 50-58 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 31-38 and 1 respectively.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Claims 1-58 are rejected.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FOLLANSBEE JOHN, can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

/Khanh Dinh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2151